

Judicial Workload Assessment

Superior Court of Arizona, Mohave County

**Final Report
March 2012**

**Daniel J. Hall
Vice President
National Center for State Courts
707 17th Street, Suite 2900
Denver, CO 80202**



Judicial Workload Assessment

Superior Court of Arizona, Mohave County

**Final Report
March, 2012**

*Suzanne Tallarico, Project Director
John Douglas, Project Staff
Erika Friess, Project Staff*

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Executive Summary	ii
Judicial Workload Estimate	ii
<i>Time study</i>	ii
<i>Qualitative Adjustments</i>	iii
Judicial Resource Assessment	iii
<i>Judicial Resource Supply</i>	iii
<i>Judicial Demand</i>	iii
<i>Judicial Need</i>	iv
Introduction.....	1
Overview: Workload Assessment Model	2
Methodology	3
Workload Estimate.....	4
<i>Time Study</i>	4
<i>Case Weight Calculation</i>	4
<i>Case Weight Adjustment</i>	5
<i>Workload Calculation</i>	7
Resource Assessment.....	7
<i>Judge Resource Supply</i>	7
<i>Judicial Officer Demand</i>	8
<i>Judicial Officer Need</i>	9
Case Assignment Tool	11
Keeping the Model Current	15
Appendix A: Time Study Data Elements.....	16
Non-Case Specific Events.....	17
Appendix B: Time Study Data Elements – Activities	18
Case-Related Events	18

Acknowledgements

This project could not have been completed without the assistance and direction of the Advisory Committee who made time in their busy schedules to meet with the NCSC staff and to review materials throughout the study. The Advisory Committee members are listed below. All of these individuals devoted time and attention to the planning and methodology of the study, and their substantial contributions are greatly appreciated.

Mohave County Superior Court Judicial Productivity Study Advisory Committee

Hon. Richard Weiss, Former Presiding Judge and Committee Chair
Hon. Charles Gurtler, Presiding Judge
Hon. Julie Roth, Superior Court Judge
Kip Anderson, Superior Court Administrator
Lorrie Back, Caseflow Manager, Court Administration
Kyle Rimel, Court Technology Services Director
Virlynn Tinnel, Clerk of Court

Executive Summary

The Mohave County Superior Court faces a challenge shared by many courts, determining the optimum number of judges needed to successfully complete the work of the Superior Court. Maintaining an adequate level of judicial resources is essential to effectively manage and resolve court business while upholding a high level of customer service. In order to meet these challenges, an objective assessment of the number and allocation of judges needed to handle caseloads is necessary. To this end, the Court contracted with the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), with funding through a technical assistance grant from the State Justice Institute (SJI) to conduct a judicial workload assessment for the Superior Court.

As is true in all courts, cases in the Mohave County Superior Court vary in the level of complexity and amount of judicial time and attention needed to be successfully resolved. Given that judicial officers handle multiple cases with varying levels of complexity, measuring judicial workload can appear to be—and at times is—an arduous task. This study utilized a weighted workload assessment methodology with a time study data collection procedure to translate judicial workload into an estimate of judicial need. The two primary analyses used by the weighted workload assessment are:

- **Judicial workload estimate**—judicial workload calculation is based upon the average amount of time a judge needs to resolve a case and the annual number of cases in the court.
- **Judicial resource assessment**—this is a series of calculations comparing the current available judicial resources to the resource demand predicted by the model.

Judicial Workload Estimate

The judicial workload value represents the total number of minutes of annual case-specific work and is calculated from case weights and annual filings. This measure is based upon baseline filing data and current practices, the challenge is to provide judges sufficient time to *reasonably* engage litigants, listen to victims, clearly explain rulings and orders—features that are part of the Court’s Strategic Plan, and that are fundamental to the public perception of fairness and appropriate treatment by the court. Calculating an estimate of judicial workload is the first phase in a weighted workload assessment. Data generated from the time study are then used, in conjunction with case filing numbers, to develop a judicial officer resource needs model for the Court. Additionally, a caseload calculator was developed for the Superior Court, which will allow the Presiding Judge to equalize judicial caseloads according to workload demands.

Time study

The major products from the time study portion of a weighted workload assessment are the individual case weights. Case weights are used to calculate the overall judicial workload values. In this study, individual case weights were generated for 22 distinct case types.¹

Each case weight represents the average amount of time it takes a judicial officer to

¹ Some case time spent on post conviction relief, probation violations and post decree work was extracted to develop a separate and distinct case weight. Case types for which probation violations and post conviction relief time was extracted include: Felony Drug, Felony Non-Drug and Other Criminal. Case types for which post decree time was extracted include: Dissolution (with and without children), Paternity, Child Support and Orders of Protection.

process the case from filing to resolution.² Final case weights were developed after a qualitative adjustment discussion. Qualitative adjustments take into account unique aspects of case processing not adequately captured by the time study data or when insufficient time is recorded in a particular case type or category. Any case weight adjustment is accompanied by clearly articulated rationale and justification. The case weights are applied to the annual filings for the Superior Court and a workload value is derived. The overall workload model including the calculated case weights and workload values are presented in Table 3.

Qualitative Adjustments

The time study measured how judicial officers in the Mohave County Superior Court currently process cases. This measure of “what is” allows the NCSC staff to develop a set of case weights which measure the status quo of case processing. Theoretically, case weights could be adjusted to allow the Court to move toward “what should be” if Advisory Committee members believed there was not enough time to process cases under the current circumstances.

The Advisory Committee reviewed individual case weights to determine whether they seemed reasonable and whether the time study period included an adequate representation of the work required in each case type category.

In this instance the Advisory Committee did not make qualitative adjustments to the model; however, the Committee did insert

² For those case types not typically resolved in a year, the case weight represents the average amount of time spent annually on the case type.

time where insufficient data was recorded to develop a representative case weight.

Judicial Resource Assessment

Overall, the projected judicial resource need is determined through the following three steps:

- Judicial Resource Supply – the current judicial resources available for judicial work (in this case, eight judicial officers)
- Judicial Demand – calculation of the number of judicial officers necessary to complete the work of the court
- Judicial Need – difference between the judicial demand calculation and the judicial officer supply

Judicial Resource Supply

The judicial resource supply value is the number of full time equivalent (FTE) positions available to process the workload of the court. The Mohave County Superior Court has six full time Superior Court judges and two full time Pro Tem judges, for a total of eight judicial officers.

Judicial Demand

The judicial demand value is calculated by dividing the judicial workload value by the judicial average annual availability value and represents the judicial full time equivalent (FTE) needed to process the case-specific work of the court. The judicial average annual availability value is the total amount of time per year that a judge has available to process his or her workload. This value was reached by the Advisory Committee after careful consideration of the typical number of days per year and hours per day that a judicial officer should be available to work on case-specific and non-

case-specific activities. This value accounts for weekends, holidays, sick days and vacation time.

By applying the case weights to an average of 2010 and 2011 filings, the NCSC staff were able to obtain the expected workload for the Mohave Superior Court. Dividing the workload value by the judge year value produces the judicial demand. The calculated judicial demand for all court-related work in the Mohave County Superior Court is 10.16 FTE.

Judicial Need

The judicial need value is the comparison of the predicted judicial demand to the judicial resource supply currently available to process cases.

This study determined that the Superior Court requires additional judicial resources to manage the work of the Court. Specifically, 2.16 additional judicial officers are needed to adequately handle the work before the court using an average of 2010 and 2011 filings.

Table ES-1: Total Judicial Need

Judicial Resources (FTE)	Superior Court Judicial Officers
Judicial Case-Specific Resource Supply	8.00
Judicial Predicted Resource Demand	10.16
Supply/Demand Difference	-2.16

Introduction

A clear measure of court workload is central to the determination of how many judges are needed to effectively and efficiently resolve all cases coming before a court. Raw and unadjusted case filing numbers offer little information concerning the amount of time judicial officers spend handling cases. In response to this challenge, state judicial leaders are increasingly turning to more sophisticated techniques to obtain quantitative documentation of judicial resource needs in state trial courts. Assessing the judicial workload through the development of a workload assessment model is a rational, credible, and practical method for determining the need for judicial officers.

While case counts have a role in determining the demands placed on judicial districts, they are silent about the resources needed to process the vast array of cases effectively. Case filing numbers offer only minimal guidance regarding the amount of judicial work generated by those case filings. Moreover, the inability to differentiate the work associated with each case type creates the potential misperception that equal numbers of cases filed for two different case types result in equivalent amounts of case-specific work. Similarly, just knowing how many open cases a judicial officer has on his or her docket does not provide a clear indication of the workload associated with that caseload.

For example, a “typical” serious felony case has a greater impact on judicial resources than a “typical” misdemeanor case. For this reason, the NCSC staff believe that a comprehensive program of judicial workload assessment is the best method for measuring case complexity and determining the need for judicial resources.

Currently, there are six Superior Court judges and two pro tem judges (for a total of eight judicial officers) to process case filings in the Mohave County Superior Court. The NCSC staff worked in concert with the Mohave County Superior Court to conduct a judicial workload assessment study to develop case weights specifically for this court, based on their case types and current practices. This project was supported by a technical assistance grant through the SJI.

This report details the methodology of the Mohave County Superior Court Judicial Workload Assessment Study and presents a workload model indicating the judicial officer

resource needs for the court. The primary goals of the project were (1) to establish judicial workload standards conducive to effective and efficient case resolution, (2) to provide a viable tool to predict future judicial officer need and (3) to develop a caseload calculator tool that can assist in assessing individual judges' caseload demands based upon the workload standards.

Overview: Workload Assessment Model

A judicial workload assessment model is a quantitative representation of the inter-related variables that work together to determine judicial resource needs. The core of the workload assessment model is a time-study whereby judges keep track of the amount of time spent working on each of the case types under investigation. When the time-study data are joined with case filing data for the same time period, it is possible to construct a "case weight" or workload standard. The case weights represent the average judicial time required to handle a case from filing to disposition within a one year period of time.³

The utility of a case weight is that it summarizes the variation in judicial time by providing an average amount of time per case. Some cases take more time than the case weight and some take less time than the case weight; but, on average, the case weight accurately reflects the typical amount of time needed to process specific case types. Once developed, case weights can be used to calculate the expected annual judicial workload needs for the court.

Applying the case weights to current or projected annual case filing numbers results in a measure of annual judicial workload. These workload values are then divided by the amount of work time available for an individual judicial officer, resulting in an estimate of required judicial resources. This approach is straightforward and sufficiently rigorous to measure resource needs and evaluate resource allocations.

It is important to note that even the most widely used and accepted resource assessment techniques, including the workload assessment model, will not determine the *exact* number of judges needed to stay current with caseloads. No quantitative resource assessment *model* by

³ The workload methodology employed here is used to determine resource needs for a one-year period of time. While not all cases are resolved within a one-year period of time, the case weights provide an average measure of the time required to process a case within a one-year period.

itself can accomplish that goal. Results from a workload model should be used in concert with other considerations, including budget constraints, population trends, and other more qualitative, court-specific factors that may impact the need for judicial resources, such as satellite courts where a single judge is in residence.

However, with this in mind the Advisory Committee reviewed the draft case weights and need model and determined that the quantitative data at face value would provide a sufficient and an accurate assessment of case processing times in which to build the final model. What was required was the analysis and insertion of data where data sets were incomplete or where court events did not occur in sufficient numbers to compile a statistically valid sample (such as jury trial time). Adjustments made regarding these circumstances are discussed later in this report under the section entitled “Case Weight Adjustment.”

Methodology

Two fundamental pieces of information are necessary to determine the judicial resources required to handle the total court workload demand. The two pieces of information are:

- *Workload Estimate.* Workload is generated by multiplying the following two components:
 1. The case weights which represent the average amount of time spent on case processing as determined by the time study
 2. The annual number of case filings
- *Resource Assessment.* The assessment of judicial resources is based upon the following three calculations:
 1. Judicial resource supply
 2. Judicial demand
 3. Judicial need

The primary goal of the Workload Assessment Study is to provide an accurate picture of the amount of time judges need to resolve different types of cases in an *efficient* and *effective* manner. Each step of the study is discussed in more detail below.

Workload Estimate

Time Study

A time study measures case complexity in terms of the average amount of judicial time actually spent annually to process different types of cases, from the initial filing to final resolution, including any post-judgment activity that may occur. The essential element in a time study is collecting time data on all judicial activities. Judicial officers are asked to record all of the time they spend on various case types on a daily time log and then enter their time on a web-based data collection instrument. Judicial matters include time spent on and off the bench, processing cases, case-specific work and non-case-specific work. Non-case-specific activity is a broad category and includes activities that cannot be attributed to a specific case, such as en banc meetings, general office and administrative tasks, and community speaking engagements. The non-case-specific activities and case types for the current study are provided in Appendix A.

NCSC staff provided training for all judicial officers participating in the study on how to record their time and complete the web-based data collection instrument.⁴ The training was conducted the week before the commencement of the time study, thereby giving participants the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the data collection tools. Study participants recorded their time on a web-based data collection instrument which submitted all data directly into a database maintained by the NCSC. The judges were allotted eighteen weeks in which to collect twelve weeks worth of data. The data collection effort was very successful and participation rates were perfect.

Case Weight Calculation

The calculation of draft case weights involves summing the annualized time spent on case-specific activities and dividing that value by the case filings for a commensurate one-year period.⁵ The draft case weights were presented to the Advisory Committee for review and discussion of adequacy of time currently available to process cases and possible quality adjustments.

⁴ On-site training was provided August 9, 2011. Each judicial officer received hands-on training as well as written instructions on how to manually track and electronically record their time.

⁵ For example, to compute the case weight for Felony Drug F2-F6, the total number of minutes recorded during the time study were annualized to equate to one years' time by all judicial officers (49,519 minutes annually). This number was divided by the total number of Felony Drug F2-F6 cases filed in one year (372). The case weight computation is: $49,519 \div 372 = 133.11$.

Case Weight Adjustment

The final case weights reflect the outcome of a structured study of judicial workload that involved a time study, the discussion regarding adequacy of time to process cases and careful review by the Advisory Committee. This comprehensive process provides a more accurate prediction of workload and resulting judicial resource need than any single process, as each step validates the prior step to account for unique practices and challenges of the Mohave County Superior Court. The case weights for each case type were reviewed by the Advisory Committee to determine if any qualitative adjustments were necessary.

The review and subsequent discussion brought to light two issues requiring adjustments to the model. First, the Committee agreed that the time and attention required for matters involving Probation Violation, Post Conviction Relief and Post Adjudication/Post Decree work in criminal cases (except capital cases), Dissolution (with and without children), and Paternity, Child Support IV-D, and Orders for Protection cases warranted separate and distinct case weights. Therefore, the aforementioned time that was originally included in those case weights was removed and analysis was completed to produce separate *sub* case weights. Furthermore, as discussed earlier several court events did not occur in sufficient quantity or did not occur during the data collection period in order to capture a fair representative sample of time to build a viable case weight. In those instances the Advisory Committee, utilizing a Delphi, or an expert opinion methodology, provided conservative estimates of time where this time was missing. Some case weights were adjusted by adding time for jury and bench trials and for some out of court work pertaining to research and writing of decisions; this time was only added where little or no time was recorded in those activities during the time study.

The final case weights are presented in Table 1. Since the case weights account for quantitative and qualitative aspects of case processing, the final weights are accurate, valid and credible.

Among the criminal case types listed, Capital Cases require the greatest amount of judicial officer time (2,052.79 minutes, or approximately 34 hours) while Complex Civil cases had the second highest case weight at 767.14 minutes, or just under 13 hours. As noted earlier, perhaps no case is an “average” case, taking exactly 767.14 minutes of judge time, but on

average, Superior Court judges spend this amount of time on a single Complex Civil case such as a medical malpractice case or construction defect case. Some cases take more time and some cases take less time. Generally, case weights are lower for those high volume case types with a lower likelihood of appearance in court.

Table 1: Case Weights for Mohave County Superior Court

CASE CATEGORY	CASE TYPE		CASE WEIGHT (in minutes)
CRIMINAL	1	Capital Cases	2052.79
CRIMINAL	2	Felony Drug F2 - F6	133.11
CRIMINAL	3	Felony Non-Drug F1 - F6	167.78
CRIMINAL	4	Other Criminal (fugitive warrant, search warrant)	21.46
CRIMINAL		Probation Violations	31.16
CRIMINAL		Post Conviction Relief	35.64
CIVIL	5	Tort - Motor Vehicle	149.80
CIVIL	6	Tort - Non-Motor Vehicle	192.91
CIVIL	7	Complex Civil (including Med.I Mal., Construction Defect, Elder Abuse & Homeowners' Claims)	767.14
CIVIL	8	Contract	110.91
CIVIL	9	Other Civil (Eminent Domain, JP Civil Appeal, Name Change, Non- Classified)	23.56
DOMESTIC	10	Dissolution - Children	177.46
DOMESTIC	11	Dissolution - No Children	67.99
DOMESTIC		Post Adj/Post Decree: Dissolution (case types 10, 11, 12, 14)	74.76
DOMESTIC	12	Paternity	145.32
DOMESTIC	13	Child Support - IV-D	104.24
DOMESTIC		Post Adj/Post Decree: Child Support IV-D (case type 13)	21.65
DOMESTIC	14	Orders for Protection	35.33
PROBATE/OTHER	15	Estates/Trusts	71.87
PROBATE/OTHER	16	Guardianships/Conservatorships	138.24
PROBATE/OTHER	17	Mental Health	45.82
JUVENILE	18	Juvenile Dependency	299.92
JUVENILE	19	Juvenile Severance/Emancipation	362.67
JUVENILE	20	Juvenile Delinquency	80.58
JUVENILE	21	Juvenile Drug Court	406.01
JUVENILE	22	Adoption	25.69

Workload Calculation

The Advisory Committee agreed that the most accurate representation of the work of the court would be best represented by averaging the 2010 and 2011 filing numbers. This accounts for the fact that the casework represented during the time study was largely conducted on cases filed during both 2010 and 2011. Applying the case weights to the average 2010 and 2011 annual filings produces the overall judicial case-specific workload for the court. Using these case filing figures the annual case-specific workload value for the Superior Court is calculated to be 771,249 minutes.

Resource Assessment

Judge Resource Supply

The judicial resource supply value is the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) judicial officers currently available to process the case-related and non-case specific workload of the court. To determine current available judicial resources, the number of funded FTE judicial officer positions was obtained for the Mohave County Superior Court. To adjust for the amount of time spent on non-case-specific activities, the average amount of non-case specific time recorded during the time study (an average of 80 minutes per day)⁶ was subtracted from the time available for direct case-specific work. Accounting for the non-case specific work decreases the average expected 7.5-hour work day from 450 minutes to 370 minutes.⁷ Practically speaking, the presiding judge bears a greater burden of the administrative work attended to by the court. According to current case assignment procedures at the Superior Court in Mohave County, the presiding judge actually receives cases at a slightly lower rate than all the other judicial officers which accounts for the additional administrative duties associated with the presiding judge position. This additional administrative time is not accounted for in the current model, resulting in a slight undercount of the judicial resources needed for the court.

⁶ In a review of weighted caseload studies conducted by the NCSC between 1996 and 2006, the average time associated with non-case specific work is 84 minutes. This study did not separate out the average non-case specific time required for presiding judges. (See *Examination of NCSC Workload Assessment Projects and Methodology: 1996-2006*, by John Douglas, National Center for State Courts).

⁷ The use of a 7.5-hour work day is consistent with the federal governments' Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), which bases the average work day on a 9-hour day with a 1-hour lunch and two 15-minute breaks. The use of a 7.5-hour day is standard for NCSC workload assessment studies for judges, court staff and probation officers and related staff.

Judicial Officer Demand

The judicial demand value is calculated by dividing the judicial workload value by the judge year value and represents the judicial FTE needed to process the case-specific work of the court. The judge year value is defined as the number of days a judge has to process his or her assigned caseload in a one year period. Weekends, holidays, vacation, sick leave and time required for education and training are deducted from 365 days to arrive at the judge year value of 219 days. The average workday is defined as 7.5 hours, minus 23.24 minutes per day to account for the average annual travel, minus 80 minutes of non-case specific work per judge, for a final workday of 347 minutes per day. Converting the workday into minutes and multiplying that by the number of available days results in the average annual availability of judges. In Mohave County's Superior Court, judicial officers average 98,550 minutes of availability annually (219 days x 7.5 hours x 60 minutes).⁸ Calculations for the judge year value are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Calculation of Judicial Annual Availability Value

	Days	Minutes
Available Time	365	164,250
LESS		
Weekends	104	46,800
Holidays	10	4,500
Leave (vacation, illness)	27 ⁹	12,150
Judicial Education	5	2,250
TOTAL TIME	219	98,550
LESS		
Average annual travel time per judicial officer (23.24 min/day)		-5,090
Non-case specific time (80 min/day)		17,520
TOTAL CASE SPECIFIC TIME AVAILABLE		75,940

⁸ Additionally, 5,090 minutes are subtracted to account for judicial travel at 23.24 minutes per day and 17,520 minutes are subtracted to account for non-case specific work (219 days x 80 minutes per day).

⁹ When the Advisory Committee met in May, 2011, they were asked to determine the "judge year value" for Mohave County Superior Court judges. This task involves determining the number of days judges are expected to work in a year, and requires the Committee to identify the number of state holidays, average vacation and sick leave and time required for education and training. While the number of weekend days and holidays are easily accessible, data on vacation, sick and education/training days was not, which required the Committee to make an educated guess regarding the average amount of time allotted to each of these categories.

When the workload values are divided by the total case-specific time available (75,940 minutes per year) the result is the total judicial officer need for the court.

Judicial Officer Need

The judicial need value is the comparison of the predicted judicial demand to the judicial resources currently available to process cases (judicial availability). This study determined that the Mohave County Superior Court requires an additional 2.16 judicial officers to complete the work brought before them (based on the average 2010 and 2011 court filings). In the future, applying the case weights to annual case filing figures will present the updated resource need scenario. Based on the current average of 2010 and 2012 filings, the model indicates the Mohave County Superior Court needs a total of 10.16 judicial officers: 3.16 judicial officers for Criminal Cases, 2.17 judicial officers for Civil Cases, 2.96 judicial officers for Domestic Cases, .55 of a judicial officer is needed for Probate/Other Cases, and 1.32 judicial officers are needed for Juvenile Cases. The model is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Judicial Officer Need Mohave County Superior Court

	Case Type	Case Weight	Cases Filed	Minutes Required Annually
Criminal	Capital Cases	2052.79	1	2,052.79
	Felony Drug F2 - F6	133.11	372	49,518.73
	Felony Non-Drug F1 - F6	167.78	985	165,263.76
	Other Criminal	21.46	279	5,987.18
	Probation Violations	31.16	493	15,361.79
	Post Conviction Relief	35.64	57	2,031.75
Civil	Tort - Motor Vehicle	149.80	122	18,275.60
	Tort - Non Motor Vehicle	192.91	54	10,417.19
	Complex Civil	767.14	14	10,739.93
	Contract	110.91	733	81,297.03
	Other Civil	23.56	1857	43,743.48
Domestic Relations	Dissolution w/ Children	177.46	568	100,800.05
	Dissolution w/o Children	67.99	609	41,408.66
	Post Adj/Post Decree: Dissolution	74.76	351	26,239.18
	Paternity	145.32	190	27,611.66
	Child Support IV-D	104.24	121	12,613.36
	Post Adj/Post Decree: Child Support	21.65	118	2,554.78
	Orders for Protection	35.33	382	13,496.76
Probate	Estates/Trusts	71.87	239	17,177.37
	Guardianship/Conservatorship	138.24	166	22,947.94
	Mental Health	45.82	36	1,649.56
Juvenile	Juvenile Dependency	299.92	126	37,790.03
	Juvenile Severance/Emancipation	362.67	19	6,890.73
	Juvenile Delinquency	80.58	472	38,035.48
	Juvenile Drug Court	406.01	35	14,210.27
	Adoption	25.69	122	3,133.81
	Case Specific Workload (Weight x filings)			771,249
Resource Needs	Judge Average Annual Availability (219 days)			98,550
	Case related travel per day (23.24 minutes per day)			5,090
	Average non-case specific work (80 minutes per day)			17,520
	Average case-related availability per year (in minutes)			75,940
	Judicial Officer Demand			10.16
	Judicial Officer Demand: Criminal			3.16
	Judicial Officer Demand: Civil			2.17
	Judicial Officer Demand: Domestic			2.96
	Judicial Officer Demand: Probate			0.55
	Judicial Officer Demand: Juvenile			1.32
	Total Judicial Officer Demand			10.16

Case Assignment Tool

One feature that differentiates the work completed for the Mohave County Superior Court workload assessment projects from other workload studies was the development of a case assignment tool. The tool was requested to enable the presiding judge and the court administrator to use the case weights in a “real time” manner to ensure equitable distribution of the workload across all judicial officers in the Superior Court. To this end, an interactive tool was developed on a spreadsheet that incorporates the expected case-specific work year for the presiding judge and for the other judicial officers on the bench. The case assignment tool provides the ability to adjust the case-related work year for the presiding judge to account for an increased administrative workload.¹⁰

The case assignment tool is simply a tool that allows the presiding judge and court administrator to view the number of cases assigned to each judge, by case type, and determine the degree of capacity that each judge is working. As caseloads ebb and flow and the mix of different case types changes, so too does each judges’ workload. A case assignment tool was constructed utilizing case weights to assess the workload across the bench to ensure the most consistent and equitable workload distribution. The current model indicates the need for an additional 2.16 judicial officers in Mohave County Superior Court. When the case filing numbers used to build the model (an average of 2010 and 2011 cases) are distributed across the eight judicial officers currently working in the Mohave County Superior Court, it is clear that all judges are working well over 100% of capacity. Table 4 presents the case assignment tool using a fictitious distribution of the 2010-2011 cases filed in the Mohave County Superior Court.

The case assignment tool also differentiates between judicial officers with a different mix of caseloads. In the second example, shown in Table 5, of the use of the caseload calculator, Presiding Judge and Judicial Officer 2 both have 729 cases assigned to them. However, because the cases have different *case weights*, their *workload capacities* are different, with Presiding Judge working at 107.17% capacity, compared to Judicial Officer 2 at 96.38% capacity. Clearly, this example illustrates how caseload numbers are not the same as workload.

¹⁰ For example, the presiding judge may find that he spends an average of four hours per day (240 minutes) on administrative work associated with his role as presiding judge. In this event, his expected work year could be reduced by an additional 160 minutes (80 minutes per day are currently built into the average work year value), resulting in a case related work year value of 40,900 minutes.

It is anticipated that the case assignment tool can be used to assess workload across the bench to ensure the most consistent and equitable workload possible. The case assignment tool using the collapsed category weights provides less distinction regarding the time requirements by case type, but should give the Court a general idea of workload comparisons across all judicial officers. If such time comes that the case management system is able to differentiate cases by the more refined case types for which case weights have been developed, the Court should be able to more meaningfully assign cases to ensure equitable caseloads to all judicial officers on the bench.

Table 4: Case Assignment Tool Sample Case Distribution

100% JO FTE 75,940 minutes annually																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																					</		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----	--	--

Table 5: Case Assignment Tool Sample Case Distribution for Two Judicial Officers to Illustrate the Difference between Case Numbers and Workload

100% JO FTE								
75,940 minutes annually	75,940							
100% JO FTE								
75,940 minutes annually	75,940		Presiding Judge			Judicial Officer 2		
			Number of Cases	Annual Workload	% of Full FTE Caseload	Number of Cases	Annual Workload	% of Full FTE Caseload
CRIMINAL	Case Weights	Cases Assigned	1380	84215	110.90%	938	97113	127.88%
Capital Cases	2052.79	1	0	0.00		1	2052.79	
Felony Drug F2 - F6	133.11	372	0	0.00		124	16506.24	
Felony Non-Drug F1 - F6	167.78	985	0	0.00		328	55031.99	
Other Criminal	21.46	279	0	0.00		93	1995.73	
Probation Violations	31.16	493	0	0.00		164	5110.21	
Post Conviction Relief	35.64	57	0	0.00		19	677.25	
CIVIL								
Tort - Motor Vehicle	149.80	122	20	2996.00		0	0.00	
Tort - Non Motor Vehicle	192.91	54	25	4822.77		0	0.00	
Complex Civil	767.14	14	5	3835.69		0	0.00	
Contract	110.91	733	120	13309.20		0	0.00	
Other Civil	23.56	1857	900	21200.40		0	0.00	
DOMESTIC								
Dissolution w/ Children	177.46	568	128	22715.50		0	0.00	
Dissolution w/o Children	67.99	609	55	3739.70		51	3467.72	
Post Adj/Post Decree: Dissolution	74.76	351	33	2467.08		33	2467.08	
Paternity	145.32	190	18	2615.84		18	2615.84	
Child Support IV-D	104.24	121	11	1146.67		11	1146.67	
Post Adj/Post Decree: Child Support	21.65	118	10	216.51		10	216.51	
Orders for Protection	35.33	382	0	0.00		41	1448.60	
PROBATE								
Estates/Trusts	71.87	239	30	2156.16		25	1796.80	
Guardianship/Conservatorship	138.24	166	20	2764.81		18	2488.33	
Mental Health	45.82	36	5	229.11		2	91.64	
JUVENILE								
Juvenile Dependency	299.92	126	0	0.00		0	0.00	
Juvenile Severance/Emancipation	362.67	19	0	0.00		0	0.00	
Juvenile Delinquency	80.58	472	0	0.00		0	0.00	
Juvenile Drug Court	406.01	35	0	0.00		0	0.00	
Adoption	25.69	122	0	0.00		0	0.00	

Keeping the Model Current

In the absence of any significant changes in case processing, court structure, or jurisdiction in the Arizona or Mohave County Superior Court Judicial system, the case weights developed during the course of this study should be relatively accurate for the next five to seven years. Periodic updating is necessary to ensure that the case weights continue to accurately represent the judicial case processing and workload. Increased efficiency, statutory or procedural changes, or implementation of various caseload management initiatives over time may result in significant changes in case processing

Workload assessment models such as this can be used effectively in judicial resource management. The real power of the model lies in its applicability in predicting future judicial resource needs with caseload projection analysis. Projected caseloads can be easily inserted into the model to provide an estimate of future judicial requirements.

Appendix A: Time Study Data Elements

CRIMINAL

- 1 Capital Cases
 - 2 Felony Drug F2 – F6
 - 3 Felony Non Drug F1 – F6
 - 4 Other Criminal (fugitive warrant, search warrant, lower court appeals, grand jury activity)
 - Post Conviction Relief (will be recorded as an activity, see notes on next page)
 - Violation of Probation (will be recorded as an activity, see notes on next page)
-

CIVIL

- 1 Tort – Motor Vehicle
 - 2 Tort - Non MV
 - 3 Complex Civil (e.g., Med Malpractice, Construction Defect, Elder Abuse. Homeowners' Claims and cases with large numbers of parties; MUST use complex flag in AJACS when using this case type)
 - 4 Contract
 - 5 Other Civil (Eminent Domain, JP Civil Appeal, Name Change, Non classified)
-

DOMESTIC RELATIONS

- 1 Dissolution – Children
 - 2 Dissolution - No Children
 - 3 Paternity
 - 4 Child Support – IV D
 - 5 Orders for Protection
 - Default Activity (will be recorded as an activity, see notes on next page)
-

PROBATE

- 1 Estates/Trusts
 - 2 Guardian/Conservatorship
-

MENTAL HEALTH

- 1 Mental Health
-

JUVENILE

- 1 Juvenile Dependency
 - 2 Juvenile Severance/Emancipation
 - 3 Juvenile Delinquency
 - 4 Juvenile Drug Court
 - 5 Adoption
-

Non-Case Specific Events

1. Non-Case-Related Administration - Includes work directly related to the *administration or operation* of the court.

- Personnel issues
- Case assignment
- Calendaring
- Management issues
- Internal staff meeting
- Budget
- Presiding Judge Administrative time

2. Judicial education and training - Includes continuing education and professional development (COJET), reading advance sheets, statewide judicial meetings, and out-of-state education programs permitted by the state.

3. Community activities, education, speaking engagement - Includes time spent on community and civic activities in your role as a judge, e.g., speaking at a local bar luncheon, attendance at rotary functions, or Law Day at the local high school. This activity also includes preparing or officiating at weddings for which you are not paid.

4. Committee work and related meetings. Includes all committee meeting time (local, county, state or other and any committee-related work. *Travel to and from committee meetings is recorded as travel time (item #5 below).*

5. Travel time - Includes all work-related travel except your normal commuting time to and from your normal assignment.

6. PTO/Other leave - Includes any non-recognized holiday/military leave time. DO NOT record statewide, recognized holidays as they have already been accounted for in the determination of the Judge Year Value.

7. Holiday – September 5, the Labor Day Holiday November 11, the Veteran’s Day holiday occur during the time study period. If you take the holiday and **do not work**, please record 8 hours of time in this category. If you **do work** this day (in chambers or at home, please record your work time in the correct categories).

8. Other -- Includes all other work-related, but non-case-related tasks that do not fit in the above categories.

9. NCSC Time Study Data Reporting --- includes all time associated with recording time for the time study.

Appendix B: Time Study Data Elements – Activities

Case-Related Events

IN COURT

1. Pre trial

Includes: initial appearance/arraignment, pretrial hearings and motions, pretrial conferences, calendar call, in and out-of-court settlement conferences, pretrial management conferences. This category includes activity whether it is on or off the record.

2. Jury trial

Includes all activities occurring during a jury trial, including jury selection and activities through entry of verdict – or – through entry of guilty plea, settlement or dismissal prior to verdict.

3. Bench trial/Non-trial disposition

Includes all judicial activities occurring during a non-jury trial through entry of final judgment/decision by the judicial officer – or—through entry of guilty plea, settlement or dismissal prior to final judgment/decision by the judicial officer (excluding “writing opinions/decisions”).

4. Post-trial/Post adjudication

Includes sentencing/dispositional hearings, post judgment activity, writs and related activities, sentence review hearings.

5. Probation violations

For criminal cases only. Includes all activity related to probation violations (note that this is listed as a case type above as well). We will collect it as an activity, but analyze it (develop a case weight) as a case type.

6. Post-conviction relief

For criminal cases only. Includes all activity related to PCRs (note that this is listed as a case type above as well). We will collect it as an activity, but analyze it (develop a case weight) as a case type.

7. Default

For domestic relation and civil cases only. We will collect it as an activity and include it within the case weight breakdown

OUT OF COURT

8. Reviewing files/research/orders

Includes search warrants (at home as well as in chambers), under advisement, anything in chambers or otherwise out of court.

9. Case-related research/Writing decisions

Includes time spent doing research for and writing decisions (work in chambers

10. Post Decree: Reviewing files/research/orders

Post decree work in chambers or otherwise out of court.

11. Post Decree: Case-related research/Writing decisions

Post decree: Includes time spent doing research for and writing decisions (work in chambers
